



211  
106

# Canadian Citizenship and Imperial Defence

REPRINT BY  
Canadian Defence League

Room 212, St. James' Chambers  
TORONTO, CANADA

## OBJECTS OF THE LEAGUE.

1. To awaken the public mind to the serious importance of national defence, and to aid in bringing about the adoption of the most effective and economical system to that end.
2. To carry on a non-political, educational campaign looking to the adoption of the principle of patriotic, unpaid, or universal naval or military training, in the belief that such training conduces to the industrial, physical and moral elevation of the whole people, and is essential to national safety.
3. To co-operate with the various Provincial educational authorities, the Department of Militia and Defence, and the Trustees of the Strathcona Fund, in introducing physical and military training into the schools of Canada.
4. To aid in securing the systematic physical and military training of all youths between the ages of fourteen and eighteen.

---

## ORGANIZING COMMITTEE.

Lt.-Col. Wm. Hamilton Merritt (Chairman); Walter James Brown (Hon. Secretary); Rev. T. Crawford Brown, M. A.; J. T. Fotheringham, M. D.; Jas. L. Hughes; E. H. Keating, C. E.; Prof. W. Lash Miller; Mrs. S. Nordheimer.

880115

A 901  
C5  
70.0138  
PXX

# Canadian Citizenship and Imperial Defence.

---

SPEECH BY MR. L. S. AMERY,  
(Fellow of All Souls, Oxford,)

At luncheon at the Canadian Military Institute, Toronto,  
September 23rd, 1910.

Lt.-Col. W. Hamilton Merritt, the President, presiding.

---

In introducing the speaker the chairman said that as a Military critic, as the Editor of the "Times History of the South African War," and as an ardent Imperialist, Mr. Amery was well known to the members of the Institute. He looked forward with feelings of the keenest interest to the address to which they were about to listen, for he believed the subject was virtually the coping stone of the Imperial Federation Movement which started in England and was taken up here a good many years ago.

In 1888 the then Imperial Federation League in Canada, by resolution, made it one of their objects to advocate a trade policy between Great Britain and her colonies, by means of which a discrimination in the exchange of natural and manufactured products will be made in favor of one another and against foreign nations.

Then in 1892 a step further was taken, and a resolution again passed by the same organization, that in the event of preferential inter-Imperial trade-relations being adopted in the British Empire it is the opinion of this League that Canada will be found ready and willing to bear her share in a just and reasonable proportion of Imperial responsibilities.

Surely, said the chairman, it might reasonably be contended that since that great Imperial statesman, the Rt. Hon'ble Joseph Chamberlain, and his many distinguished followers in England, including our guest, have taken up the matter of Colonial preference and tariff reform, to carry it to certain victory, the object of the second resolution can well be considered as having been accomplished. If that view is taken then it should be our duty and our pleasure now to show to what extent Canada is ready and willing to shoulder her part of Imperial burdens. Here is where Mr. Amery can help us, and where, I feel sure, he will help us, by suggest-

ing what Canada can do—if not what she should do—to make herself safe and thereby make the Empire strong.

Mr. Amery on rising was warmly greeted, and he said :—

The subject I suggested when Colonel Merritt asked me a few days ago to speak to the members of the Canadian Military Institute was that of "Canadian Citizenship and Imperial Defence."

I should like, before dealing with the specifically Canadian and Imperial aspects of the subject, to say a few words on the more general question of Citizenship and Defence. The point I should like to bring out is that the defence of one's country is an essential part of national life—an essential element in citizenship. We so often come across the view, both in writing and in speeches, that all the effort or expenditure that a nation undertakes for its defence is a mere burden, a drain upon its prosperity, unavoidable perhaps, but certainly to be regretted. We are continually told that the national expenditure of money and effort on defence is a purely unproductive expenditure. Now that is an entirely wrong point of view to take. The work of defence done by citizens in the defence of their country, is just as much productive work as that done by the doctor who defends us against disease, the lawyer who defends us against injustice, the architect or builder, who provides our defence against the weather. Of course there have been occasions when nations have wasted their substance and their energies unduly on military work, just as there have been occasions when they have wasted their substance and strength in other ways, as for instance in building pyramids.

National defence then is an essential and necessary element in national life. More than that. For the individual the defence of his country is one of the highest duties of citizenship. Military service teaches us that we have obligations to our fellow-citizens as well as to ourselves. There is no way in which that sense of obligation is brought home to a man more deeply than when he undertakes the responsibility of defending his country, when he undertakes to sacrifice his life, if necessary, on behalf of his fellow-countrymen.

Again defence, so far from being a mere burden, can be utilised as an instrument to help on national progress in every direction. A government which takes the question of defence in hand seriously and intelligently will find itself compelled to look after the national welfare in every other respect. Success in war depends to no small extent on the material resources of the contestants. A nation that wishes to win in war will look to the development of its industry and commerce in peace. It will look



no less to the health of its citizens in peace so that it may have strong and healthy men to fight for it in war. Again, in modern war the individual soldier is called upon not only to be healthy, well trained and well disciplined, but to be intelligent and self-reliant as well. A Government which wishes to be successful in war will therefore devote no small attention to the development of character and to the spread of education among its citizens. In the case of Prussia, it was her national system of education which played no small part in preparing for her victories over Austria and France. Above all, it is essential that a country's soldiers should be animated with a feeling of patriotism and a readiness to sacrifice all for her cause. But this can only be when the political and social conditions are such that every citizen is interested in his country's welfare. Even social and political reform are indispensable elements in any permanently effective policy of national defence.

We now come to the particular problem of Canada's defence and of its part in Imperial defence. Canada certainly has something for her citizens to defend. She has institutions which we consider the best in the world. She has an immense future on this continent. She has before her the whole inheritance of the British Empire. These are things well worth defending, things worth making the greatest sacrifices for. But at the same time, just because of her connection with the Empire, Canada is not called upon to make as great a sacrifice as most other countries are. The burden of Canada, as long as she remains a part of the Empire, will never be so great as if she stood alone. It will never be so great as to interfere with the development of her material prosperity. There can never be any question of Canada's having to impose a crushing military burden upon her people in order to preserve her national existence, as states like Prussia have been compelled to do in the past.

I know there is a certain class of people, a very small class, I think, who say that Canada is not even called upon to take any share in the defence of the Empire. Canada, they say, has throughout her whole history been in an extraordinary and exceptional position. She has had the British Empire to defend her hitherto, and now if the British Empire falls to pieces all she has to do is to let go and lean on the United States. Now I cannot believe that any of you gentlemen here regard Canada as a parasite nation. The spirit of Canadians has never been that, and never will be. Canadians, I believe, are ready and willing to take their full and responsible share in the defence of the Empire, and I hope they are not less ready to take their full share in the control of Imperial policy.

Let us now consider what that share means. Canada, I am glad and proud to say, has now made a beginning in taking her share in Imperial Naval Defence in the creation of the Canadian navy. Now naval defence is the foundation of Imperial security. Our Empire is divided—or rather united—by the sea, and as long as the British Empire is supreme at sea so long will its position be secure. The moment we lose command of the sea this Empire of ours will fall to pieces. We have maintained for a long time the two-power standard. If you will allow me, I will suggest a reason for this two-power standard. It is not simply the desire of Britain to be twice as strong as anyone else, not merely an extra insurance against all risks, however remote. It is the necessary result of the position of the British Empire in the world. The British Empire and its trade interests are scattered over the whole of the world. It is really half a dozen Empires in one. All over the world our interests are continually coming into contact with the interests and ambitions of other nations. Points which may involve friction and causes for trouble are far greater than in the case of other countries. The danger of finding ourselves in conflict with two nations at once is consequently such that we must always be prepared to have more than one opponent at the same time, and that is the true explanation and significance of the two-power standard. The maintenance of this two-power standard of ours has been the means of keeping the peace of the world on many occasions in the past generation. The years between 1885 and 1905 were years of acute crises in the history of the world. All the great European powers were struggling for dominance in Africa and in Asia, and if it had not been for the British navy that period would have been accompanied by wars as bloody and as costly as those which witnessed the partition of the new world 100 years ago. Again and again we were on the eve of war with France, Russia and Germany, and on each occasion, as for instance in the Fashoda crisis, when they counted their battleships and then counted ours, they saw it was not worth the risk, and thus the peace of the world was kept. In those years we won a whole series of bloodless Trafalgars. It is by the light of that experience that we must look upon the dangers which have been suggested by German naval growth. I believe and hope the time will come when Germany, as well as France, will be joined to us by the closest ties of friendship, but that can only be when we have made it quite clear to Germany that under all circumstances we mean to maintain our supremacy, that we mean to offer her no temptation to attack.

The cost of maintaining this two-power standard is such

that the 40,000,000 people in Great Britain will not much longer be able to bear it. I am glad and proud that Canada has recognized that the time has come for her to take part in that burden and responsibility. As to the method which she has chosen of assuming her share in naval defence, I think she has chosen wisely. I think the establishment of a Canadian navy, administered by the Canadian Government, corresponds to the present constitutional position in the Empire, and will also, I think, maintain a keen interest in Canada on naval matters, and will result in a determination to improve steadily on what has been done so far. I am not one who would quarrel with the method of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his Government with regard to what is proposed towards naval defence. But there are two suggestions I would like to make. The first is that in equipment, style of ship and organization, the Canadian navy should be such as to form an integral unit of the Imperial Navy. Don't let it be a mere local navy tied to your shores. There is little use in a navy which, after the war is over and all the great battles fought, has to haul down its flag to the enemy. What Canada needs is a navy containing ships that can take their place in the line of battle with the British Fleet, and can help to make victory certain.

The second suggestion I would make is that you insist on continuous and free interchange of visits and individuals between the Canadian and the British navies. I hope the time will soon come when vessels of the Canadian Navy will interchange regularly for considerable periods with corresponding vessels of the British Navy. Even more important is that your officers should interchange freely with officers of the British Navy. In a small service promotion is very slow and the opportunities for training are far and few between. A brilliant man entering such a service and becoming keen on his work would, after a very short time, find there was very little chance of promotion and the keenness would go out of him. The mere fact that the British Navy is so large, and offers such wonderful opportunities for training and promotion, would of itself make it worth Canada's while endeavoring to secure a continuous interchange of officers, in order to keep her officers efficient, and offer a very great career to them. But the British Navy is not merely the greatest navy in the world. It has the finest fighting tradition in all the world, the finest records of heroism and duty. The glorious tradition of Hawke and Rodney, of Wilson and Collingwood, is alive in the British Navy today, and Canada has only to ask for her sons to be given the opportunity of sharing in that tradition. It would be folly if Canada did not insist that her sailors should



have the doors of the Imperial Navy open to them at all times, and that the doors of her own navy should at the same time be open to welcome officers of the Imperial Service. If this is secured, then every boy leaving the Naval College at Halifax can feel that he has the same chance to rise to command of the Empire's fleets, to become the Nelson of some great struggle of the future, as a boy passing through Osborne College in England.

I think the same thing applies to whatever body of Regular Officers it is desirable to maintain in this country, either for training purposes or for such purposes as the defence of Halifax. Let there be as free an interchange as possible between them and the officers of the British Regular Army. Something has already been done in this respect by Mr. Haldane in his General Staff scheme, which involves an interchange of staff officers. Indeed if the Canadian Government has to keep up complete regular units such as the Battalion at Halifax, why should not those units be interchanged with troops in other parts of the British Empire? Why should not the battalion now at Halifax go for a year or two to Aldershot and a battalion from Aldershot take its place? An even bolder suggestion I should like to bring before you for consideration is, how far it might not be practicable to have a permanent interchange of your troops with the forces of India? You all know that a very large proportion of the British Regular Forces are kept in India and paid for by the Indian Government. For every battalion in England there is an equivalent one in India with which it keeps up a constant interchange. This affords officers and men in the British Army an opportunity not only of seeing the world, but of taking part in manoeuvres on a larger scale than anything in England, and of perfecting themselves in the art of leadership and in staff work. If Canada had to keep up regular units here there is no reason why it should not let the Indian Government keep up corresponding and interchanging units in India, so that the officers of the Permanent Force in Canada might be able from time to time not only to enjoy the opportunities for training and experience in Field Staff Work afforded by association with the great forces of the Indian Empire, but might also individually share in all the prospects of high promotion open to the officers of those Forces. What you should insist on is that if a Canadian wishes to become a professional soldier and joins the permanent force in Canada he should have the same opportunities of rising throughout the Empire as an officer who goes to Camberley and joins the Imperial Forces.

But, important as is the part the Canadian Navy may yet play in Imperial Defence, important as it is that her permanent

military establishment shall be in close contact with the British regular forces, **THE REALLY PRESSING AND SUPREME QUESTION FOR CANADA TO CONSIDER IS THE ORGANIZATION OF HER CITIZEN FORCES FOR THE DEFENCE OF HER LAND FRONTIER**, a frontier larger than that possessed by any other nation in the world. Now I know there are some people who say, "The defence of Canada against the United States—how absurd—what nonsense to talk about that!" Now I cannot understand that attitude. As long as nations are separate nations, with frontiers that touch, with economic interests that may clash, they have always got to consider the possibility of war. For my part, I think the friendship of the United States is one of the first things that British statesmanship, and Canadian statesmanship, should always be working for. At the same time we have to remember that although we can be responsible for our own policy we cannot be responsible for the policy of any other country. We cannot say who may be controlling the destinies of the United States 10 or 20 years hence, or what their attitude may then be towards Canada or towards the British Empire. More than that, international friendship is most securely based when it is based on respect as well as on mere good-will. If Canada wishes to develop her national life in her own way, and to maintain a good understanding with the United States, she must also secure the respect of the United States. Friendliness based on feebleness evokes no certain response. It is Canada's duty to cultivate friendship with her neighbor, and she will do it all the better if she feels confident and capable in her own strength and valour if trouble should come.

I saw in a paper the other day a criticism on a summary of General French's report, in which the writer takes General French to task for even considering the possibility of an American invasion, and says that the very idea is enough to make Canadians smile. I know Canadians have smiled in the past at the thought of an American invasion. But that was after the Battle of Queenston Heights! I don't think Canadians today can do otherwise than regard the problem gravely and seriously, with an earnest desire to maintain for 100 years more, as in the past 100 years, the friendship of the United States, but with the knowledge that such friendship can be maintained only by mutual respect and by our confidence in our own power to defend our rights.

As to the method necessary to secure the safety of Canada, it is not for me to prescribe. I have read with very great interest the forecasts which have been made of General French's report. That report will no doubt soon be published in full, and then you

gentlemen, as well as the Government of Canada, can consider what steps it is desirable to take to carry out the recommendations contained in that report. Whether these recommendations based, as I understand they are, on the existing military system of the Dominion, and not containing any very startling innovations, will even, when adopted in their totality, provide sufficiently for the protection of Canada, is another question. Personally, I HAVE ALWAYS FELT THAT THE MOST EFFECTIVE, AND BY FAR THE BEST FORM OF HOME DEFENCE FOR A FREE COMMUNITY IS THAT IN WHICH EVERY CITIZEN IS TRAINED TO TAKE PART IN THAT DEFENCE. Certainly my study of the South African War hammered home into my mind that conviction, and impressed me with the immense defensive strength possessed by a free people whose law is that every citizen should take part in the defence of his country and be trained with that object. That system has now been adopted by the democratic Governments of Australia and New Zealand. It will, I hope, before very long be adopted by the Mother Country. There are a great many, a steadily growing number, who are convinced of the necessity of universal citizen training in England today. We have now over 140 members of Parliament who have openly declared their sympathy with us, and this encourages us to hope that it will not be very long before success is achieved. As for Canada, it is for you and for the people of Canada as a whole to consider what is best for your particular conditions. BUT I DO COMMEND TO YOUR SERIOUS ATTENTION THIS PARTICULAR FORM OF DEFENCE, WHICH IS NOT ONLY, FROM A MILITARY POINT OF VIEW, THE MOST ECONOMICAL, BUT WHICH CAN BE MADE TO DO A GREAT DEAL FOR THE PHYSICAL WELFARE OF THE CITIZENS, AND WHICH CAN DO EVEN MORE IN PROMOTING A SENSE OF DISCIPLINE AND PATRIOTISM. AND LET ME REMIND YOU THAT DISCIPLINE AND PATRIOTISM ARE ESSENTIAL TO EVERY COUNTRY, NOT FOR PURPOSES OF DEFENCE AGAINST EXTERNAL AGGRESSION ONLY, BUT ALSO FOR INTERNAL PEACE AND FOR THE GROWTH OF MATERIAL PROSPERITY. IT IS THE ABSENCE OF THESE QUALITIES THAT SOONER OR LATER LEADS TO INTERNAL TROUBLE, TO INDUSTRIAL CRISES AND SOCIAL CONFLICT. ONLY A PATRIOTIC AND DISCIPLINED NATION CAN IN THE LONG RUN HOPE TO BE PROSPEROUS AND CONTENTED.

These are but a few of the many considerations which enter into what, for us citizens of the Empire, is the greatest problem of our time. There is no Empire in the world which can so eas-

ily be made invincible against attack as the British Empire, once its vast territories are developed and peopled as they should be, and once they are united in really effective partnership for common purposes. The difficulty and the danger lie in the present period of transition. The short-sightedness of a past generation has allowed the best of our manhood to people foreign countries instead of our own Dominion, has given the great market of England to build up the agriculture and industries of foreigners and rivals, has neglected all opportunities for common consultation and co-operation within the Empire. All the greater is the duty imposed upon us to make good the mistakes of the past. We must build up the young nations that are growing on the vast open spaces of the Empire. We must join hands together and find a practical working scheme of partnership. AND MEANWHILE WE MUST GUARD WHAT WE HAVE GOT—AND THAT IS PERHAPS THE MOST IMMEDIATE AND MOST PRESSING TASK BEFORE US.

---